

**Application No.:** 10/550,297  
**Filing Date:** September 21, 2005

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

On January 22, 2008, Applicant's representatives, attorneys Daniel Hart and Cynthia Arko, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiner Schillinger at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The interview was also attended by Examiner McDermott.

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 21.

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent Nos. 5,549,665 (Vesely et al.); 6,767,362 (Schreck); and 4,506,394 (Bédard).

### Proposed Amendments

Replace "in combination with an intraparietal reinforcement device" in Claim 21 with "and at least one intraparietal reinforcement device" to resolve clarity objections to Claims 22, 23, and 26.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Attorneys Hart and Arko noted that the cited references disclosed valves placed over a wire framework, and not an intraparietal reinforcement device. The meaning of the term "intraparietal" was discussed. Examiners Schillinger and McDermott suggested that Applicants clarify that the rod penetrates the thickness of the tubular outer wall of the animal aortic valve.

### Results of Interview

Examiners Schillinger and McDermott agreed that the cited references do not disclose a reinforcement device that pierces or penetrates the thickness of the valve's tubular outer wall. Attorneys Hart and Arko agreed to amend Claim 21 to further clarify that the claimed device penetrates the thickness of the valve wall.